

**RFQQ 05-14**  
**Questions and Answers**

**Q:** In reading through the RFQQ I saw that you require a notice of intent to bid in your Estimated Schedule of Procurement Activities table, however, I cannot find any reference to such a notice in the RFQQ body. Is this email adequate to notify you of \_\_\_\_\_'s intent to bid or do you require a formal response on company letterhead?

**A:** Email is an acceptable form of written notification.

**Q:** The database structure shown in the RFQ appears well thought out, and I am interested to know:

- if any implementation has occurred to date
- what are the requirements to integrate previous database listings

**A:** We currently do not have any implementation to date. The analysis and design phases have been completed. We are seeking additional technical resources for development.

Currently, it is not a requirement for the VRDB to integrate with existing database systems at the Office of the Secretary of State. The VRDB will become the central database repository for other database systems to interface with

**Q:** I was wondering if the RFQQ incorporated Transport needs, e.g. T1's, Ethernet Frame Relay or ??.

**A:** No. The scope of the RFQQ is only for the programming assistance and consultation covered under the Statement of Work

**Q:** We have a strong interest in the Washington Database and are interested in potentially providing a proposal. However, it would be beneficial to the state, in our opinion, if we were to have the benefit of the referenced requirements document to help prepare our proposal. Therefore, we are respectfully requesting an extension of the proposal submission deadline of at least two weeks.

**A:** The due date for responses has been extended by two weeks. See RFQQ 05-14 Addendum #1.

**Q:** As you may know, \_\_\_\_\_ is one of the 4 state qualified EMS vendors in RFQQ No. 05-14. One of the stated functions of the consultant is that we would serve as the primary liaison to the 4

EMS vendors to work out details of the interface. \_\_\_\_ would like to know now if, due to our being one of the qualified vendors, we would be disqualified from being the chosen consultants on the interface project described in this RFQ.

Section 3.2.1.b states: "Consultants must clearly disclose any formal affiliation with a hardware/software manufacturer or vendor, including employment with such an entity or serving as a seller/reseller of the vendor's products. If, after AGENCY review of this information it is determined by the AGENCY that a conflict of interest exists such that the consultant may not provide an objective approach to the work being requested, the consultant may be disqualified from further consideration for the award of a contract."

**A:** After some internal discussion, our agency believes that a conflict of interest exists. We are asking the selected contractor to be the primary liaison with the four EMS vendors listed in the RFQQ, and to work with our agency to recommend how we fund the vendors to develop the needed front end interface. If one of the four EMS vendors is chosen, it certainly could be – or perceived to be --the case that they would be in a position to benefit their own company and potentially negatively affect one of the competitor vendors.

As a result, we will not consider proposals from EMS vendors utilized within Washington State

**Q:** Would the successful bidder be precluded from bidding on a subsequent RFP should the state elect to purchase, rather than build, their centralized voter registration system?

**A:** Yes.

**Q:** After reviewing the RFQQ and the evaluation and award criteria, we do not have enough information to develop a not to exceed estimate or commit to the dates requested in the RFQQ. The RFQQ does reference a requirements document that is due to be completed on November 18. This document might provide the level of detail that we would need to develop a plan that we could use to commit to dates and costs. I'd also like to request another week (extend deadline to December 8) to submit our response, assuming that the requirements document is issued this week and available for us to review.

**A:** The due date for responses has been extended by two weeks. See RFQQ 05-14 Addendum #1.

**Q:** We recently reviewed the RFQQ, and have some questions for you. It would be even more helpful if we can speak with you over the phone.

**A:** Questions and answers will only be in writing, as stated in Section 2.1 of the RFQQ.

**Q:** What is the breakdown by county of which EMS system are installed, including those counties with no EMS system?

**A:** This breakdown is included in the Excel spreadsheet attachment labeled "County VRS Auditors", and is attached as Attachment F of the RFQQ (and referenced in Addendum #1).

**Q:** Is there a copy available of the Requirements document mentioned on page 5?

**A:** It is anticipated that this will be available on November 18th, although we are not guaranteeing that at this time. When it is available, it will be posted on our web site, [www.secstate.wa.gov](http://www.secstate.wa.gov), associated with this competitive procurement.

**Q:** Is there a detailed list of other agencies and all their databases that would need to be integrated?

**A:** The other primary agencies and their databases that will be handled by this contract are the 39 counties and their election management systems. Other state agencies involved with the Voter Registration Database are the Dept. of Licensing, Dept of Health, and the Washington State Patrol, but integration with their databases is not the primary concern of this contract.

**Q:** Page 5 states that Financial support for the EMS vendors to develop front-end connectivity is not financed. What is the dependency of the overall project of the front-end connectivity in the EMS systems?

**A:** The project is dependent on the front end connectivity of the EMS systems used by the counties. The RFQQ states that "*Financial support to the EMS vendors for development of the front end connectivity will be separately financed (not financed under this RFQQ)*".

**Q:** How many agency personnel are currently and will be assigned to this project? Roles, experience, etc.?

**A:** There are currently 4 staff positions planned for this project: VRDB Development Manager (Currently being recruited), IT Application Specialist 4 (filled), IT Application Specialist 3 (vacant), and IT Systems Specialist 3 (vacant). These are project positions, funded through January 2006.

**Q:** How much HAVA federal funds have been awarded to the agency for this project?

**A:** There is no fixed level of funding. However, with many competing priorities for HAVA funds, vendors are encouraged to submit their most competitive bid.

**Q:** Are there any State funds allocated for this project?

**A:** No.

**Q:** Has the agency discussed this project with other States in the US, such as Oregon, to see if there is a solution that can be transferred?

**A:** We have discussed our planned approach with other states, but we are not intending to partner with any other states in the development of the solution. This is partially because state election laws and practices vary so widely.

**Q:** Can the work be done partially off-site?

**A:** Yes.

**Q:** Can the response date be extended to allow for more time to research and estimate cost given the short timeline between the availability of the Requirements Doc. And the due date?

**A:** The schedule has now been extended. See Addendum #1 posted on our web site, [www.secstate.wa.gov](http://www.secstate.wa.gov) associated with this competitive procurement.

**Q:** Is it acceptable to bid a multi-phased project, where phase 1 the detailed cost and work breakdown is determined?

**A:** No.

**Q:** Are there dedicated resources at each county available to support the project, and if so who is funding their effort?

**A:** That varies on the county. We anticipate that their support will be provided primarily by their election system vendor.